

CAI  
XC 14  
- R 11

Government  
Publication

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

1955

---

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

RAILWAYS, CANALS AND  
TELEGRAPH LINES

*Chairman*—H. B. McCULLOCH, ESQ.

---

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 1

---

Bill No. 187, An Act Respecting The New Westminster  
Harbour Commissioners

---

TUESDAY, MARCH 22, 1955

---

WITNESS:

Mr. K. K. Reid, Chairman, The New Westminster Harbour Commissioners.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.  
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY  
OTTAWA, 1955.



STANDING COMMITTEE  
ON  
RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES

Chairman: H. B. McCulloch, Esq.,  
and  
Messrs.

Barnett	Fulton	Johnston ( <i>Bow River</i> )
Batten	Gagnon	Kickham
Bell	Garland	Lafontaine
Bonnier	Gauthier ( <i>Lac-Saint-</i>	Langlois ( <i>Gaspe</i> )
Boucher ( <i>Restigouche-</i>	<i>Jean</i> )	Lavigne
<i>Madawaska</i> )	Goode	Leboe
Boucher ( <i>Chateauguay-</i>	Gourd ( <i>Chapleau</i> )	McIvor
<i>Huntingdon-Laprairie</i> )	Green	Meunier
Buchanan	Habel	Montgomery
Byrne	Hahn	Murphy ( <i>Lambton West</i> )
Campbell	Hamilton ( <i>Notre-Dame-</i>	Murphy ( <i>Westmorland</i> )
Carrick	<i>de-Grace</i> )	Nicholson
Carter	Hamilton ( <i>York West</i> )	Nickle
Cauchon	Harrison	Purdy
Cavers	Healy	Ross
Clark	Herridge	Small
Decore	Hodgson	Stanton
Deschatelets	Holowach	Viau
Dupuis	Hosking	Villeneuve
Ellis	Howe ( <i>Wellington-Huron</i> )	Vincent
Follwell	James	Weselak

R. J. Gratrix,  
*Clerk of the Committee.*



ORDERS OF REFERENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, February 4, 1955.

*Resolved*—That the following Members do compose the Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines:

Messrs.

Barnett	Fulton	Lafontaine
Batten	Gagnon	Langlois ( <i>Gaspe</i> )
Bell	Garland	Lavigne
Bonnier	Gauthier ( <i>Lac-Saint-Jean</i> )	Leboe
Boucher ( <i>Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie</i> )	Goode	Low
Boucher ( <i>Restigouche-Madawaska</i> )	Gourd ( <i>Chapleau</i> )	McCulloch
Buchanan	Green	McIvor
Byrne	Habel	Meunier
Campbell	Hahn	Montgomery
Carrick	Hamilton ( <i>Notre-Dame-de-Grace</i> )	Murphy ( <i>Lambton West</i> )
Carter	Hamilton ( <i>York West</i> )	Murphy ( <i>Westmorland</i> )
Cauchon	Harrison	Nicholson
Cavers	Healy	Nickle
Clark	Herridge	Purdy
Decore	Hodgson	Ross
Deschatelets	Hosking	Small
Dupuis	Howe ( <i>Wellington-Huron</i> )	Stanton
Ellis	James	Viau
Follwell	Johnston ( <i>Bow River</i> )	Villeneuve
	Kickham	Vincent
		Weselak

*Ordered*—That the Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House; and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers and records.

FRIDAY, March 11, 1955.

*Ordered*—That the following Bills be referred to the said Committee:

Bill No. 193 (Letter Q-6 of the Senate), intituled: "An Act respecting The London and Port Stanley Railway Company and the Corporation of the City of London".

Bill No. 232 (Letter P-6 of the Senate), intituled: "An Act respecting The Bonaventure and Gaspé Telephone Company, Limited".

MONDAY, March 14, 1955.

*Ordered*,—That the following Bill be referred to the said Committee:

Bill No. 187, An Act respecting The New Westminster Harbour Commissioners.



## STANDING COMMITTEE

MONDAY, March 21, 1955.

*Ordered*,—That the name of Mr. Holowach be substituted for that of Mr. Low on the said Committee.

TUESDAY, March 22, 1955.

*Ordered*,—That the said Committee be empowered to print such papers and evidence as may be ordered by the Committee and that Standing Order 64 be suspended in relation thereto.

*Ordered*,—That the quorum of the said Committee be reduced from 20 to 12 members and that Standing Order 63(1) (b) be suspended in relation thereto.

*Ordered*,—That the said Committee be authorized to sit while the House is sitting.

Attest.

LEON J. RAYMOND,  
*Clerk of the House.*



## REPORTS TO THE HOUSE

TUESDAY, March 22, 1955.

The Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines begs leave to present the following as its

### FIRST REPORT

Your Committee recommends:

1. That it be empowered to print such papers and evidence as may be ordered by the Committee and that Standing Order 64 be suspended in relation thereto.
2. That the quorum be reduced from 20 to 12 members and that Standing Order 63(1) (b) be suspended in relation thereto.
3. That it be authorized to sit while the House is sitting.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

H. B. McCULLOCH,  
*Chairman.*

WEDNESDAY, March 23, 1955.

The Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines begs leave to present the following as its

### THIRD REPORT

Your Committee has considered the following Bill and has agreed to report the said Bill without amendment:


Bill No. 187, "An Act respecting The New Westminster Harbour Commissioners".

All of which is respectfully submitted.

H. B. McCULLOCH,  
*Chairman.*

(NOTE: *The Second Report dealt with Private Bills in respect of which verbatim evidence was not recorded*)





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2023 with funding from  
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761103746343>



## MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, March 22, 1955.

The Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines met at 3.30 o'clock p.m. this day. The Chairman, Mr. H. B. McCulloch, presided.

*Members present:* Messrs. Batten, Bonnier, Byrne, Carrick, Cauchon, Cavers, Decore, Deschatelets, Garland, Gauthier (*Lake St. John*), Goode, Green, Habel, Hahn, Hamilton (*York West*), Harrison, Hodgson, Hosking, Holowach, Howe (*Wellington-Huron*), James, Johnston (*Bow River*), Lafontaine, Langlois (*Gaspe*), Lavigne, Meunier, Murphy (*Lambton West*), Nicholson, Purdy, Small, Villeneuve and Weselak.

*In attendance:* Mr. K. K. Reid, Chairman, The New Westminster Harbour Commissioners; Messrs. H. V. Anderson, Director of Marine Services and R. R. Macgillivray, Legal Adviser, both of the Department of Transport.

The Committee commenced consideration of Bill No. 187, An Act respecting The New Westminster Harbour Commissioners.

On motion of Mr. Langlois (*Gaspe*),

*Resolved*,—That the Committee print 750 copies in English and 200 copies in French of the minutes of proceedings and evidence in relation to Bill No. 187, An Act respecting The New Westminster Harbour Commissioners.

Mr. Langlois (*Gaspe*), Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Transport, made a statement in explanation of the said Bill.

Mr. Reid was called, made a statement on the purposes of the said Bill and was questioned thereon.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive and the Title were severally considered and adopted.

The Bill was adopted and the Chairman ordered to report it to the House without amendment.

At 4.20 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned to meet again at the call of the Chair.

R. J. Gratrix,  
*Clerk of the Committee.*







## EVIDENCE

March 22, 1955.  
3.30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, gentlemen. Bill 187, an Act Respecting the New Westminster Harbour Commissioners.

Mr. LANGLOIS (*Gaspe*): Mr. Chairman, I am in the hands of the members of the committee as to whether or not I should make a statement about the purposes of this bill.

Mr. GREEN: I understand the chairman of the Harbour Commission is here. Perhaps he could explain the purpose of the bill. However, I love listening to the parliamentary assistant.

The CHAIRMAN: I think perhaps we had better hear him first.

Mr. LANGLOIS (*Gaspe*): Mr. Chairman, I shall be as brief as possible, because I made a comprehensive statement in the House when the resolution was introduced. As honourable members who were present in the House on that occasion know, an English syndicate headed by the estate of the Duke of Westminster have acquired Annacis Island in the Harbour of New Westminster, B.C., and propose extensive development of the island for industrial establishments. The Department of Transport has been advised the syndicate contemplates an initial expenditure of approximately \$4,000,000 to \$6,000,000 (which might go up to \$100,000,000 with the years) for erection of factories, construction of roads, draingage, etc., for some 200 industrial establishments.

Over the past several months discussions have taken place between the syndicate, the Department of Transport and Public Works, and the New Westminster Harbour Commissioners respecting a request by the developers that a causeway be erected to provide access to Annacis Island for both rail and highway traffic. The syndicate representatives were informed the Department of Public Works would not approve of a causeway, which would completely close Annacis Channel, because such a structure would increase the danger of flooding, but would be prepared to approve a structure part causeway and part trestle bridge.

It is the expectation of the commissioners that industrial development of Annacis Island will serve to effect a material increase in harbour traffic. Furthermore, the proposed structure would provide access to Robson Island which lies adjacent to Annacis Island and is owned by the commissioners.

In order to permit the commissioners to begin construction of the bridge and causeway, their by-law No. 159 was approved by Order in Council P.C. 1954-1454 dated 22 September 1954. They were thus given authority to draw upon their reserve account up to \$200,000 pending the introduction of this loan bill; such moneys to be repaid to the account upon receipt by the commissioners of the moneys raised by the bill.

I wish to add that we have here today Mr. K. K. Reid, chairman of the Harbour Commission of New Westminster. We also have Mr. H. V. Anderson, director of the marine services of the Department of Transport, and a representative of our legal branch. I am sure these gentlemen will be at the disposal of the committee to supply any information which may be felt desirable.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the committee be prepared to hear Mr. Reid now?



Mr. GOODE: Yes, always with the understanding that on questions of policy the parliamentary assistant will be here to speak.

**Mr. K. K. Reid, Chairman of New Westminster Harbours Commission, called:**

The WITNESS: I am very glad to have this opportunity of being here again before you. I was before you on the other bill and you were very kind to us at that time and we trust nothing further will happen now. I would just like to say in addition to what the parliamentary assistant has said that this island consists of 1,200 acres and is somewhat similar to the development which the Grosvenor estates have near Manchester, England. We have negotiated for some three years in connection with this, and one of the first intimations we had was from the solicitor of the Grosvenor estate, and he said that more than 60,000 were employed on that estate near Manchester. I thought that he was being a little over optimistic, but I found out since that he was not. He was putting it rather mildly because the number employed there is actually greater than that. We felt that the development of the island would create employment and that anything established for that purpose would be worth while looking into. This is not a promotion scheme to sell shares or raise money. These people are bringing money with them to develop the site. They buy the land, develop the property, put in all the services, roads, administration buildings and so on and then they lease them for an extended length of time. So it is not a case of building up and selling something to get something. This will carry on. They are getting on very well with it. The administration building is about finished and many roads are in. Our agreement with them was to spend considerable money before we would entertain this question of getting a causeway to them although it develops 100 acres of our own. We wanted to make sure they intended to go ahead with it, so they entered into an agreement with us that they would spend \$4 million before the end of this year. That is the situation and I think they will have that much expended. I think it is the only establishment of this kind in Canada where they come in and develop it, bring in capital and develop a scheme like this. I have heard it asked: "Why do they come here. Why do they not settle in some other part of the continent, eastern Canada or in and around Vancouver?" That is very true, but knowing the geography of the lower mainland you can readily understand that any development in Vancouver towards the harbour frontage is pretty well taken up, consequently development must be eastward and the Fraser River is the logical place for that to happen. The reason we asked the government for permission to use our reserve funds, we have to get this started is because of the men and supplies which they have had to take over to the island which has to be transported by boat or scow. Their manager in British Columbia told me that it was costing them \$800 a day and that is why they are anxious to get across by truck or rail. That is why we wanted to assist them and go ahead. When we asked for a Bill last year we were too late to get it, and that is the reason for the request of the Grosvenor estate that we should speed this up and save them money.

The 100 acres which we have there is very good for shipping and we believe we are going to be able to locate a shipping company on our portion of it. As a matter of fact—I am not at liberty to give out the name—I will go so far as to say that the agreement is now in the hands of the solicitor for the shipping company and the Harbour Board solicitor to work out the details. They are very near agreement on all details. I hope it will be soon or in the near future and that they will lease pretty much all the land we have in this sand field, which was formed by dredged material, from annual



dredging. This is in addition to the small island we have, known as Robson Island, both consisting of about 100 acres. There is some 4,200 feet of water-front—room for 10 ships with good water. Very little dredging will be required in that area. The tenants will construct one dock immediately and others as required.

It is a little difficult to visualize just what this means to the area. I had the privilege recently of reading an article put out by Mr. Wilson, assistant professor of Marketing School of Commerce, University of British Columbia, and he headed his article: "I wonder". It refers to Annacis Island and what it will mean to British Columbia. I would recommend that article to members of the committee who wish to get a clear picture of what this project may involve.

I do not know Mr. Chairman, but I presume there will be some questions to ask. I may say that in this Annacis Island development the Public Works who have to approve of all works, under the Navigable Waters Protection Act and who gave permission to build the causeway Trestle with a 50-50 division—that is 50 per cent causeway and 50 per cent trestle—so 50 per cent of the area, which is about 600 feet, will be left open for the water to escape.

Mr. GOODE: Have you got a map?

The WITNESS: I ought to have sufficient maps for all members of the committee at this stage, but due to the short notice I received to attend this meeting I was unable to get them. However I have one map which I trust you will all be able to see.

(Map produced and displayed to members of the committee.)

*By Mr. Cavers:*

Q. Is the island contiguous to an industrial area or a residential area?—

A. There is both industry and residential property in the area west of the causeway-trestle (To the south).

Q. If that is so have you made any agreement with the industrial area as to sewage disposal, disposal of waste, and smoke nuisance?—A. The Grosvenor estates have taken care of all services.

*By Mr. Murphy (Lambton West):*

Q. How much did they invest in the island itself?—A. I cannot tell you that, I have not been given the figure.

Q. Was that included in the \$4 million?—A. No. It was not included. They told me a great portion of this island was purchased in sterling from a syndicate in the old country which had held it for a number of years.

*By Mr. Cavers:*

Q. Is this to be used as an industrial project or partly as real estate?—

A. Wholly industrial. They provide all services, construct buildings and then rent on a long-term lease.

*By Mr. Hahn:*

Q. Is this island subject to flooding by any chance. Was it flooded in 1948?—A. The island did not flood in 1948, some seepage got through the dykes, but their idea is to build the island up with silt above the dykes. They are doing that now. As a matter of fact, they get all the silt they can during the dredging operations, and then contract with a private dredging company for additional fill, they have permission to dredge 1,400,000 yards out of the bed of the river.

Q. Have they started any building of anything such as roads to show their goodwill?—A. The administration building is about finished, and quite a few roads around the building have been completed.



Q. Has there been an agreement that we are going to be responsible for harbour facilities?—A. The agreement we have with them is that they will not put any shipping companies on the island. We in turn will not put any industry in the 100 acres we have. We will provide shipping facilities and we hope that we shall be able to take care of all the shipping. However, one has to allow dock construction to any firm who require a dock for its own use, but that is the only exception.

Q. During the original debate in the House on this bill I drew attention to the need for deeper dredging. Is that being looked after? What arrangement is being made to see that deep sea shipping can come in to the island?—A. That dredging comes under the Department of Public Works and there has been every cooperation by the department with the Harbour Board so far as carrying on dredging is concerned. Of course, in the river, the difficult time for getting ships in is after the spring freshet. No silt is deposited during the freshet but occurs when the freshet is falling off. The main problem is to get the dredging done as early as possible following the freshet, the Public Works therefore have three dredges at the most difficult areas in order to get it dredged so that a minimum of delay will be caused to shipping. Our ultimate aim is 30 feet to the gulf, as members of the committee may have heard. We have sent out full cargoes of grain, and full cargoes of other commodities. Of course we have to take advantage of the tide. A 12-foot tide at the sand heads provides 5 feet rise at New Westminster. There is seven feet difference.

Q. Is there any indication from the Department of Public Works that they were prepared to give you 30 feet draught to the gulf?—A. I would not say 30 feet, but they have not said "no" yet.

*By Mr. Hamilton:*

Q. What type of development is this—does the development company put up the building itself and then rent them out, or sell them?—A. Construct building to tenants requirement and then enter into a long term lease.

Q. In connection with the building, and this fill of silt you were talking about, does that mean that practically all construction would have to be on piles?—A. No. Only for heavy industry.

*By Mr. Goode:*

Q. Mr. Chairman, I think the committee should know that Mr. K. K. Reid is one of the most able administrators in this type of work we have ever had in British Columbia, and I think this committee is to be complimented for having a gentleman of his calibre before us today. Mr. Reid, this \$200,000, to what total will that add with regard to the indebtedness of the New Westminster Harbour Commission?—A. We have at the present a loan which was originally taken out when the elevator was built. First, it was \$700,000 and then \$274,000 odd was the second loan to finish the elevator making a total of \$974,537. That was refinanced in 1948 when the bonds expired. The elevator was built in 1928-1929. The bonds were payable in United States funds, and when they matured, they were re-financed and payable in Canadian funds.

Q. Has any of this \$974,000 been paid back?—A. No.

Q. This \$200,000. We can take it then that over a million dollars will be owned to the government, or to someone on behalf of the commission?—A. I would say it would be more than that.

Q. Perhaps so. Where was this money being spent within the city of Westminster?—A. The new docks are in the city of New Westminster.

Q. It can be taken that all this money has been spent in the confines of the city of New Westminster?—A. No.



Q. Outside of the case of the elevator which is in the municipality of Surrey, all other moneys that were secured by the Harbour Commission have been spent within the city of Westminster?—A. Yes.

Q. Not one dollar of these loans has been spent outside the confines of New Westminster except money spent on the elevator in Surrey.—A. That is correct, but I would add that Annacis island and the sand fill are in the municipality of Delta, and the causeway will be half in new Westminster and half in Delta.

Q. One has to understand that though there may be some difference of opinion over policy, I do think the expenditure of this \$200,000 is necessary, and I am going to support it because I think the development is going to be to the advantage not only of the immediate area but also of British Columbia as a whole.

*By Mr. Cavers:*

Q. Do you know how much it will cost to build this causeway trestle?—A. The causeway and trestle. The lowest tender was \$224,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON (*Bow River*): How do you propose to get this money back—by charging a toll?

The WITNESS: No, by leases of the waterfront and the development of our own area. We believe that a lease of our own area will provide sufficient revenue to take care of interest and sinking fund on this loan.

Mr. GOODE: If this development is going to run into a sum of millions of dollars for a private industrial operation, why should the federal government be interested in a loan of \$200,000? Why should not these people build their own trestle? I know the answer to that question, but I think it should be asked for the benefit of the eastern members of this committee.

The WITNESS: I can answer that, though you know the answer, Mr. Goode, as you say. The reason is simple. This was discussed with the previous Minister of Transport, and the reason was that if the Grosvenor Estates did build it, it would be private property and as we had a development there of our own, we thought that in the interests of the public it should be a public crossing.

Mr. GOODE: I agree.

Mr. HAHN: Will the witness indicate whether the Harbour volume itself was increasing to a degree where these present developments could have been expected?

The WITNESS: Yes, we were increasing. We had 43 more ships last year than the year before, and we have been gradually building up. We had 439 deep sea ships enter our port last year. We are looking to the future as well as we can. We believe this development will take care of the future for some little time.

Mr. HAMILTON (*York West*): Can the witness tell us when there will actually be industrial buildings on the island?

The WITNESS: I am told they have a date for completion of buildings for one firm of September 1st, and expect to have others as time goes on.

*By Mr. Nicholson:*

Q. Has the province of British Columbia been invited to participate?—A. The only other people invited to assist was the municipality of Delta because it was a connection to develop an area in that municipality, but they told us they did not have any money to assist in this project.

Q. Was the province not interested in this sort of development?—A. The province has nothing to do with our harbour. The harbour is under the federal government.



Mr. GOODE: Federal water, is it not?

Mr. LANGLOIS (*Gaspe*): The committee might be interested in knowing how far this work has progressed up to now.

The WITNESS: Yes. We have all the piling in, the sand filled in on the causeway part and it was just two weeks ago that two of the Grosvenor officials and myself made the first trip across by truck. About 75 per cent of the work is completed.

Mr. HAHN: Has the commission leased any of their frontage as yet?

The WITNESS: Not yet. We are hoping the firm we are negotiating with will lease the entire sand fill. We need the revenue.

*By Mr. Goode:*

Q. I would like to know something more about the commission. Your commission now consists of three members, does it not?—A. That is correct.

Q. Who are they?—A. Two are appointed by the federal government, Mr. Gifford and myself, and one is appointed by the city of New Westminster.

Q. All three live in New Westminster?—A. Yes.

Q. How long have they been living in New Westminster, those three members?—A. Commissioner Dennis has been there about 10 years, and I would hate to tell you how long Mr. Gifford and I have lived there.

Q. Yes. It is over 25 years?—

*By Mr. Weselak:*

Q. Can you estimate the total capital assets of the commission?—A. According to our auditor's statement which I have a copy here in pencil, the assets as at December 31, 1954 were \$2,177,719.

Q. We cannot hear anything that is going on.—A. All right. I will speak louder.

Q. I am not speaking of the witness, I am speaking of the other questioners.

Mr. HOSKING: You told us there was some danger of flooding in this area.

The WITNESS: No. There might have been a danger of flooding if we had closed the channel.

Mr. HOSKING: There is no danger from flooding now?

The WITNESS: We hope not.

Hon. MEMBER: He answered all this half an hour ago.

Mr. HOSKING: I was not quite satisfied with those answers. I just want to make sure we are not going to be in a position of having to pay damages.

The WITNESS: That is what the Public Works were trying to protect themselves from by leaving half the channel open.

*By Mr. Hahn:*

Q. You mentioned that silt was being put on the island. Can you give the committee an idea how high the island is being built up?—A. Well, that sand bank is probably five feet above high water at the moment and I presume it will be levelled off well above high water.

Q. What do you mean "well above"?—A. Two or three feet or perhaps four feet. That is all that will be necessary.

Mr. CAVERS: You told one of the members of the committee that you did not propose to charge tolls on this bridge. What revenue do you expect to derive from the bridge itself?

The WITNESS: Nothing. We do not expect a revenue from the bridge itself.



Mr. GOODE: This is a matter of policy—a large industrial corporation is providing employment in the province of British Columbia and we are spending \$200,000 to help them to provide that employment.

The WITNESS: That is all we have to spend.

*By Mr. Hamilton:*

Q. Have we any projection as to how many jobs will be available?—A. This is a long range program to complete. They cannot spend that amount of money overnight. When it is completed the manager told me it would be in the neighbourhood of \$100 million.

Q. What does that mean in jobs?—A. I think my earlier mention of the comparable program the corporation had carried out near Manchester, where there are 60,000 employees was made with this in mind.

Mr. MURPHY (*Lambton West*): There would be a good many men employed now I suppose?

The WITNESS: Between 150 and 200.

*By Mr. Goode:*

Q. I wonder now if I could go into the limit control of the Harbour Board a little because, as Mr. Reid knows, I have very definite views on this matter. What is the extent of the limits under the direct control of your commission?—A. Well, it is from Kanaka Creek up river, then up Pitt river to Pitt lake, both sides of the river and down the river both sides to Tilbury island and down the north arm to the borders of New Westminster city.

Q. You control the foreshore rights from Tilbury island to Kanaka Creek?—A. That is right.

Q. What is your income from these foreshore rights at the moment? Have you got figures for 1954? I have them for 1952, but not for 1954. While that figure is being looked up, may I place these figures on the record because I am going to refer to them later. In 1952 the receipts from foreshore rights in the municipality of Delta amounted to \$2,274; from Richmond, \$646; from Surrey, \$3,710; from Maple Ridge, \$5,039; from Pitt meadows, \$4,670; from Coquitlam, \$1,605; from Fraser Mills, \$1,803; from Port Coquitlam, \$3,571; and from the city of New Westminster, \$6,500. Are those figures correct?—A. No, they are low for the city of New Westminster. The city is nearly \$10,000. A good portion of the property within the limits of the city is under crown grant to the city, and on which we do not receive any revenue. You asked the question what was the total waterfront rental for last year. It was \$55,794.

Q. How much of that came from the city of New Westminster?—A. Close to \$10,000—\$9,818.

Q. Am I correct in saying that in 1952 your commission collected something over \$25,000 from outside municipalities, and \$10,000 from the city of New Westminster. In 1954, according to your figures, you collected \$55,000 of which \$10,000 came from the city of New Westminster?—A. That is correct.

Q. Four times the amount of money came from the outside municipalities as came from the city of New Westminster?—A. Yes, if you put it that way.

Q. That is the way I would like to put it.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, shall clause 1 carry? Shall clause 1 "short title" carry?

Carried.

Shall clause 2 "Loans to corporation" carry?

Carried.



Shall clause 3 "Debentures" carry?

Carried.

Shall clause 4 "Repayment of loans" carry?

4. The principal and interest of the sums loaned to the Corporation under this Act shall be repayable by the Corporation out of all its tolls, rates, penalties and other sources of revenue, and shall rank as a first charge thereon, subject to the repayment of debentures issued by the Corporation prior to the commencement of this Act.

Mr. GOODE: Mr. Chairman, I am going to try to develop the fact that my municipality, Richmond, should be represented on this board. I am going to develop it because of the fact that clause 4 says:

4. The principal and interest of the sums loaned to the Corporation under this Act shall be repayable by the corporation out of all its tolls, rates, penalties and other sources of revenue . . .

Mr. Reid has given us the figures, and I have put the figures for 1952 on the record, and we have put them in for 1954, I think, showing that, in my parlance, four times the income payable to this board is coming from the outside municipalities.

I must not put this question to Mr. Reid because it is a matter of policy. That is why I asked the parliamentary assistant this afternoon in the House if he would be here. I asked the parliamentary assistant and the Minister of Transport who appointed the seven members of the Winnipeg-St. Boniface harbour commission.

You will remember it was answered that all of those members were appointed by the municipality. Now, on March 14, in the House, I said this:

Mr. Speaker, although this bill is going to a committee I just wish to go on record as saying that I believe in this instance there should be some addition to the New Westminster Harbour commission; that my riding is much concerned with the expenditure of money by that body; and that during the meetings of the committee, of which I am a member, I shall bring this matter to the attention of the minister.

I did that so that I would not be taking the parliamentary assistant by surprise.

I have told you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, that the municipalities outside the city of New Westminster are paying four times what the city of New Westminster is paying.

I represent the municipality of Richmond which has many miles of fore-shore on the main channel of the Fraser; and that main channel up to Tilbury island is controlled by the New Westminster Harbour Commission. With all respect to Mr. Reid, I take it that we in Richmond should be represented on this commission.

I cannot ask Mr. Reid whether he would be against that argument, because it is a matter of policy. But I shall ask the parliamentary assistant whether it is the position of the department that additional representatives representing the municipalities on the main channel of the Fraser may be added to the commission in the foreseeable future.

Will the parliamentary assistant please answer that question now? I am asking the parliamentary assistant whether he will comment on the fact that I have suggested that an additional member for the municipality of Richmond be placed on the commission. What would be the attitude of the department?

Mr. LANGLOIS (*Gaspé*): Mr. Chairman, I have carefully listened to the remarks made by Mr. Goode and I was pleased to do so although his remarks were not quite related to the bill which is before the committee at present.



In the course of his remarks Mr. Goode compared the New Westminster Harbour Commission with the Winnipeg-St. Boniface commission. I wish to carry on with his comparison by pointing out that first: the members of the Winnipeg-St. Boniface Harbour Commission are not being paid, while the commissioners of the New Westminster Harbour Commission are paid. I wish to say for the information of the committee that the chairman of the New Westminster Commission is drawing a salary of \$4,800 a year, while the other members are drawing salaries of \$1,600 a year. We can hardly compare the two commissions also because, as hon. members no doubt know, the Winnipeg-St. Boniface Harbour Commission is not too active. The purpose of this commission is more or less to regulate the traffic on the two rivers concerned there.

I wish also to state in 1951, I believe it was, the membership of the North Fraser Harbour Commission was increased from three to five, and that four of the members are now being appointed by order-in-council, while one is appointed jointly by the municipalities of Richmond, Burnaby and Vancouver.

If the same principle was adopted with respect to the New Westminster Harbour Commission, it would mean, that the act would have to be amended to make provision for a joint appointtee by the ten municipalities which are within the limits of the harbour commission of New Westminster. The alternative would be to appoint 10 additional members in order to satisfy all the municipalities concerned.

The department has reached no definite policy in this connection. It might favourably consider an additional member for the New Westminster Harbour Commission appointed jointly by the ten municipalities and probably with the additional proviso, that as in the case of the harbour commission of Winnipeg-St. Boniface, this member serve without remuneration and also in an advisory capacity only.

However, as I have said, while no definite policy has been set in this respect, I am sure that the department will gladly go into the matter further and consider the representations made by Mr. Goode. I wish to add that the reason why we have not gone into the matter to a greater extent up to now is because we could not increase the membership of the commission by amending the present bill.

As you know, we cannot add to this bill. A new bill altogether would have to be introduced if we were to increase the membership of the commission.

Mr. CAVERS: There is nothing in this bill providing for that.

Mr. GOODE: Yes there is something in this bill. On December 14, 1951, I had occasion to rise in the House of Commons on another bill, and that was the North Fraser Harbour Commissioners Bill. Some of the members will recall that Mr. Mayhew the then Minister of Fisheries and I took issue with one another on the floor of the House in regard to a similar matter. May I point out that although the parliamentary assistant may make the point that the Winnipeg-St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners are not paid, nevertheless the commissioners on the North Fraser Harbour Commission are paid. I have Mr. Mayhew's remarks in front of me at the moment. He was then Minister of Fisheries and he said this: He said that it was most important, because of the expenditure of money, that the municipalities on any river should be represented on the Harbour Commission.

I was arguing exactly the opposite then to what I am arguing now. I did not want the Harbour Commission to be enlarged and for a good reason. But I must make the point that the Minister of Fisheries knew far better than I what should be done for the good of the country. Therefore, I change my argument now because of his large and advanced policy over mine, and he was perhaps correct when he answered that the commission at that time should be



enlarged. Now I am arguing the same way as the hon. minister did at that time, that I think this one should be enlarged too. I think that the municipality of Richmond should be represented on that board.

Mr. MURPHY (*Lambton West*): Mr. Chairman, I think this discussion has gone beyond the realm of what we are brought here to consider and I ask for a ruling on it. I think we are taking up time. I appreciate Mr. Goode's representations, but I do not think this is the place for them because there is nothing in the bill which would permit us to discuss even the membership of that commission, much less the adding to it.

Mr. GOODE: I must take up the issue because, as I have said before, this is the only opportunity I shall have to represent my people in regard to the New Westminster Harbour Commission at this session.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I think, Mr. Chairman, that you should rule on that point.

Mr. GOODE: Mr. Chairman, I have the right to speak to it before you make a ruling, and I have the right to point out that I am in order because I am very rarely out of order.

Mr. CAVERS: Well, you are out of order now.

Mr. GOODE: Section 4 mentions other sources of revenue which come to the New Westminster Commission. I point out that my municipality will pay a part of that source of revenue and I believe that I am in order in making these representations. It is my job as a member of parliament to represent the people who asked me to do it, namely the Richmond Board of Trade. As Mr. Reid knows, the Council of Richmond have asked me to do it and here I am doing it now.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, as I read section 4 it refers to the repayment of loans, and by no stretch of the imagination can I find anything in section 4 that is at all relevant to what we have been hearing from Mr. Goode.

Mr. GOODE: May I say that I have placed my representations on the record. I have done what I wanted to do and I now take my seat.

Mr. MURPHY (*Lambton West*): We are all satisfied.

Mr. HAHN: Mr. Chairman, in view of the representations made by Mr. Goode let me say that I represent the municipalities on the other side of the river as well as the city of New Westminster.

Mr. MURPHY (*Lambton West*): Are you going to be out of order too?

Mr. HAHN: That may be. I have only a point or two to make. Mr. Goode came here with the purpose in mind to see if he could not get additional members for the commission from his municipality. I think I should draw to the attention of the committee that I anticipated something of this. I sent a telegram to the responsible body in the New Westminster riding which had a resolution before the Associated Boards of Trade on this question. The board is made up of the very areas which Mr. Goode mentioned a while ago when he spoke of Maple Ridge, Pitt Meadows, Port Coquitlam, and so on. The resolution called for representations from both sides of the river be added to the harbour commission. Therefore I would like to ask the witness, Mr. Reid, whether or not these people who are on the New Westminster Harbour Commission live on the north side of the river or on the south side?

The WITNESS: They all live on the north side.

Mr. HAHN: The resolution is to be considered tomorrow night by the associated board of trade.

The CHAIRMAN: You are entirely out of order.



Mr. HAHN: I realize this whole debate is out of order. I want the committee to realize that until such time—

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Shall clause 4 carry?

Mr. JOHNSTON (*Bow River*): Mr. Chairman, this is not within my territory at all, but the chairman sat here and listened to a presentation from the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond and there was no objection to his making it. The point was drawn to the attention of the chairman, but he did not rule on it, and Mr. Goode was allowed to make his presentation. Now we have another member who gets up and who is almost immediately called to order. I submit that if we allow one member to make a representation, then in all fairness we should allow the other member to make his representations as well.

The CHAIRMAN: Very well. Go ahead.

Mr. HAHN: The point is that this whole matter of representations is being considered in the associated boards of trade meeting which is being held tomorrow night, at which Richmond has a representative in the person of the reeve of the municipality.

I attended such meeting at which this same question was discussed, and the board itself could not come to a decision. I as an individual am interested in the whole question and I have no objection to an addition from Richmond on the harbour commission, nor have I an objection to Surrey or any other municipality being represented on the commission; but until such time as the whole area can decide what they want, I would not like to see the department recommend that another member be added from Richmond and Surrey or any other part of the area. I think I have put the statement fairly and would ask the minister to wait until recommendations in this respect come from some responsible body.

Mr. LANGLOIS (*Gaspe*): Though our department operates in a very efficient manner, we will not reach a decision that fast in the case.

Mr. GOODE: We will give you two weeks.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 4 carry?

Carried.

Shall the title carry?

Carried.

Shall the bill carry?

Carried.

Shall I report the bill without amendment?

Agreed.

Mr. CAVERS: Before the meeting adjourns I think we should express our thanks to the chairman of the New Westminster Harbour Commission for his kindness in coming here and giving us evidence. It has been most helpful.

The CHAIRMAN: The meeting is now adjourned to the call of the chair.



